(e) what is the normal period taken in revising the prices of formulations after the announcement of price revision of bulk drug?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE [MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) to (e) In regard to the details asked for in the Question, the information is too voluminous and the time and efforts required for compiling this information will not be commensurate with the results likely to be achieved.

Increase in the prices of Marcain Injection and Tripertdol

3079. SHRI K. G. MAHESWARAPPA: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 664 given in the Rajya Sabha on 5th September, 1991 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the price of Marcaine Injection has been increased four times and that of Triperidol six times;

(b) what are the reasons for such steep increases in the prices of formulations;

(c) what is the name of drug on which each product is based and what was its price before DPCO, 1987 and at present;

(d) what is the increase in ex-factoty cost and MAPE;

(e) how such steep increases missed monitoring in his Ministry and whether his ministry received details in fonn-2A before effecting increases; and

(f) if so, what are the details of break up given of each product?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): ()a to (f) No. Sir, To the extent available!, information has been given in the Statement annexed. There has been decrease in the rate of MAPE charged on these two formulations. The increase in Ex-factory cost does not appear to be steep.

Statement

Sl. No.	Name of the formulation and bulk drug involved	Pack size	Price prior to the existing price/MAPE (in Rs.)	Existing price/MAPE (in Rs.)	% increase	Increase in ex-factory cost (in Rs.)	Increase/ decrease in MAPE
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Marcaine (Bupivaccine Hcl) 5mg	1% 2 ml vial	4·00(222·58%) (Nov., 88)	5·95(115·58%) (Aug., 91)	48·75%	(+)1·52	(—)107%
2.	Triperidol (Trifluperiodol)	60's 0·5mg	32 00(277·58%) (July, 89)	37·01(150·54%) (May, 91)	15·65%	(+)2·66	(—)77·04

Kelkar Committee

3080. SHRI R. S. NAIK:
SHRIMATI SATYA BAHIN:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 665 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 5th September, 1991 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that former Development Commissioner took on record that Kelkar Committee had been constituted, by Government and its recommendations were to be accepted;

(b) if so, how deviation could be made in few cases and what are the reasons for the same;

(c) what is the justification of exemption of small scale units from price control and inclusion of Vitamin A and Vitamin C under price control against

the recommendation of expert committee;

(d) whether it is a fact that this has resulted in shortage of Vitamin A and closure of units producing Vitamin C;

(e) Whether it is a fact that both Vitamin A and C are produced from basic stage;

(f) if so, how these drugs have been covered under price control and exempted number of imported drugs from price control; and

(g) what are the names of imported drugs out side price control?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FARTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) and (b) Due consideration was given by the then Government on all the recommendations of the Kelkar Committee before accepting or deviating with any of them.

(c) and (f) In the case of exemption to small scale units from price control in respect of Category II formulations, the Kelkar Committee did not make any specific recommendation. It was left to the Government. Vit. 'A' and 'C have been put under price control by the Go vernment on account of their impor tance.

(d) No, Sir.

(e) Yes, Sir.

(f) Manufacture of a drug from basic stage was not a criteria for exclusion from price control.

(g) Names of all the price controlled drugs are given in Schedule I and Schedule II to DPCO, 1987 as amended from time to time. All the remaining drugs, indigenous or imported, are outside price control.

Cases of Ovtrtavoidng

3081. SHRI RAFIQUE ALAM: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 1664 and 686 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 1st August and 28th November, 1991 and state:

(a) when each case of overinvoicing came to the notice of Government and when each case was referred to Ministry of Finance for investigation;

(b) what is the progress in each case;

(c) whether Government have received any report on any of the cases from Ministry of Finance;

(d) if so, what re the details and what action has I taken on each:

(e) what are the prices of drugs on which Government fixed the prices of forrmilations;

(f) what are the names of drugs which are being imported by companies from their principals and their associates; and

(g) what is the latest position of cases of overcharging referred therein and what action has been taken by Govern ment on each case?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN) : (a) to (d) A number of complaints have been received alleging over-invoicing in imports. The details of these cases were piven in part (a) of the Annexure referred to the Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question No. 1664 answered on 1st August, 1991. This department referred these cases to Directorate of Revenue Intelligence for necessary action. Recently Ministry of Finance has intimated that there is no evidence of over-invoicing in the cases referred to them. They have also clearly stated that unless specific evidence indicating over-invoicing is available no further enquiries can be made.

(e) The prices of formulations are fixed on the basis of current notified prices of the bulk drugs.

(f) The company-wise imports of individual drugs are not being monitored by this Ministry.

(g) The cases of overcharging were given in the part (b) of the Annexure referred to Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question No. 1664 answered on 1st